

# LEARNING TO CURSE

*Essays in  
Early Modern  
Culture*

**STEPHEN J.  
GREENBLATT**

**ROUTLEDGE**  
New York • London

## 2

## Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century

At the close of *Musophilus*, Samuel Daniel's brooding philosophical poem of 1599, the poet's spokesman, anxious and uncertain through much of the dialogue in the face of his opponent's skepticism, at last rises to a ringing defense of eloquence, and particularly English eloquence, culminating in a vision of its future possibilities:

And who in time knowes whither we may vent  
The treasure of our tongue, to what strange shores  
This gaine of our best glorie shal be sent,  
T'imrich vnknowing Nations with our stores?  
What worlds in th'yet vnformed Occident  
May come refin'd with th' accents that are ours?<sup>1</sup>

For Daniel, the New World is a vast, rich field for the plantation of the English language. Deftly he reverses the conventional image and imagines argosies freighted with a cargo of priceless words, sailing west "T'imrich vnknowing Nations with our stores." There is another reversal of sorts here: the "best glorie" that the English voyagers will carry with them is not "the treasure of our faith" but "the treasure of our tongue." It is as if in place of the evangelical spirit, which in the early English voyages is but a small flame compared to the blazing mission of the Spanish friars, Daniel would substitute a linguistic mission, the propagation of English speech.

Linguistic colonialism is mentioned by continental writers as well but usually as a small part of the larger enterprise of conquest, conversion, and settlement. Thus Peter Martyr writes to Pope Leo X of the "large landes and many regyons whiche shal hereafter receaue owre nations, tounes, and maners: and therewith embrace owre religion."<sup>2</sup> Occasionally, more substantial claims are made. In 1492, in the introduction to his *Grammatica*, the first grammar of a modern European

tongue, Antonio de Nebrija writes that language has always been the partner ("compañera") of empire. And in the ceremonial presentation of the volume to Queen Isabella, the bishop of Avila, speaking on the scholar's behalf, claimed a still more central role for language. When the queen asked flatly, "What is it for?" the bishop replied, "Your Majesty, language is the perfect instrument of empire."<sup>3</sup> But for Daniel, English is neither partner nor instrument; its expansion is virtually the goal of the whole enterprise.

Daniel does not consider the spread of English a conquest but rather a gift of inestimable value. He hasn't the slightest sense that the natives might be reluctant to abandon their own tongue; for him, the Occident is "yet unformed," its nations "unknowing." Or, as Peter Martyr puts it, the natives are a *tabula rasa* ready to take the imprint of European civilization: "For lyke as rasid or vnpaynted tables, are apte to receaue what formes soo euer are fyrst drawen thereon by the hande of the paynter, euen soo these naked and simple people, doo soone receaue the customes of owre Religion, and by conuersation with owre men, shake of theyr fierce and native barbarousnes."<sup>4</sup> The mention of the nakedness of the Indians is typical: to a ruling class obsessed with the symbolism of dress, the Indians' physical appearance was a token of a cultural void. In the eyes of the Europeans, the Indians were culturally naked.

This illusion that the inhabitants of the New World are essentially without a culture of their own is both early and remarkably persistent, even in the face of overwhelming contradictory evidence. In his journal entry for the day of days, 12 October 1492, Columbus expresses the thought that the Indians ought to make good servants, "for I see that they repeat very quickly whatever was said to them." He thinks, too, that they would easily be converted to Christianity, "because it seemed to me that they belonged to no religion." And he continues: "I, please Our Lord, will carry off six of them at my departure to Your Highnesses, that they may learn to speak." The first of the endless series of kidnappings, then, was plotted in order to secure interpreters; the primal crime in the New World was committed in the interest of language. But the actual phrase of the journal merits close attention: "that they may learn to speak" (*para que aprendan a hablar*).<sup>5</sup> We are dealing, of course, with an idiom: Columbus must have known, even in that first encounter, that the Indians could speak, and he argued from the beginning that they were rational human beings. But the idiom has a life of its own; it implies that the Indians had no language at all.

This is, in part, an aspect of that linguistic colonialism we have already encountered in *Musophilus*: to speak is to speak one's own

language, or at least a language with which one is familiar. "A man would be more cheerful with his dog for company," writes Saint Augustine, "than with a foreigner."<sup>6</sup> The unfamiliarity of their speech is a recurrent motif in the early accounts of the New World's inhabitants, and it is paraded forth in the company of all their other strange and often repellent qualities. The chronicler Robert Fabian writes of three savages presented to Henry VII that they "were clothed in beasts skins, & did eat raw flesh, and spake such speech that no man could understand them, and in their demeanour like to brute beasts." Roy Harvey Pearce cites this as an example of the typical English view of the Indians as animals, but Fabian is far more ambiguous, for he continues: "Of the which upon two yeeres after, I saw two apperelled after the maner of Englishmen in Westminster pallace, which that time I could not discerne from Englishmen, til I was learned what they were, but as for speech, I heard none of them utter one word."<sup>7</sup> When he sees the natives again, are they still savages, now masked by their dress, or was his first impression misleading? And the seal of the ambiguity is the fact that he did not hear them utter a word, as if the real test of their conversion to civilization would be whether they had been able to master a language that "men" could understand.

In the 1570s the strangeness of Indian language can still be used in precisely the same way. In his first voyage to "Meta Incognita," as George Best reports, Frobisher captured a savage to take home with him as "... a sufficient witnessse of the capitaines farre and tedious travell towards the unknown parts of the world, as did well appeare by this strange infidel, whose like was never seene, read, nor heard of before, and whose language was neither known nor understood of any."<sup>8</sup> For Gregorio García, whose massive study of the origins of the Indians was published in 1607, there was something diabolical about the difficulty and variety of languages in the New World: Satan had helped the Indians to invent new tongues, thus impeding the labors of Christian missionaries.<sup>9</sup> And even the young John Milton, attacking the legal jargon of his time, can say in rhetorical outrage, "our speech is, I know not what, American, I suppose, or not even human!"<sup>10</sup>

Of course, there were many early attempts to treat Indian speech as something men could come to understand. According to John H. Parry, "All the early friars endeavoured to master Indian languages, usually Nahuatl, though some acquired other languages: the learned Andrés de Olmos, an early companion of Zumárraga, was credited with ten."<sup>11</sup> Traders and settlers also had an obvious interest in learning at least a few Indian words, and there are numerous word lists

in the early accounts, facilitated as Peter Martyr points out by the fortuitous circumstance that "the languages of all the nations of these Ilandes, maye well be written with our Latine letters."<sup>12</sup> Such lists even suggested to one observer, Marc Lescarbot, the fact the Indian languages could change in time, just as French had changed from the age of Charlemagne. This, he explains, is why Cartier's dictionary of Indian words, compiled in the 1530s, is no longer of much use in the early seventeenth century.<sup>13</sup>

Indian languages even found some influential European admirers. In a famous passage, Montaigne approvingly quotes in translation several Indian songs, noting of one that "the invention hath no barbarism at all in it, but is altogether Anacreontic." In his judgment, "Their language is a kind of pleasant speech, and hath a pleasing sound and some affinity with the Greek terminations."<sup>14</sup> Raleigh, likewise, finds that the Tivitivas of Guiana have "the most manlie speech and most deliberate that euer I heard of what nation soeuer,"<sup>15</sup> while, in the next century, William Penn judges Indian speech "lofty" and full of words "of more sweetness or greatness" than most European tongues.<sup>16</sup> And the great Bartolomé de Las Casas, as he so often does, turns the tables on the Europeans:

A man is apt to be called barbarous, in comparison with another, because he is strange in his manner of speech and mispronounces the language of the other. . . . According to Strabo, Book XIV, this was the chief reason the Greeks called other peoples barbarous, that is, because they were mispronouncing the Greek language. But from this point of view, there is no man or race which is not barbarous with respect to some other man or race. . . . Thus, just as we esteemed these peoples of these Indies barbarous, so they considered us, because of not understanding us.<sup>17</sup>

Simple and obvious as this point seems to us, it does not appear to have taken firm hold in the early years of conquest and settlement. Something of its spirit may be found in Oviedo's observation of an Indian interpreter failing to communicate with the members of another tribe: "[he] did not understand them better than a Biscayan talking Basque could make himself intelligible to a person speaking German or Arabic, or any other strange language."<sup>18</sup> But the view that Indian speech was close to gibberish remained current in intellectual as well as popular circles at least into the seventeenth century.<sup>19</sup> Indeed it is precisely in educated, and particularly humanist, circles that the view proved most tenacious and extreme. The rough, illiterate sea dog, bartering for gold trinkets on a faraway beach, was far more

likely than the scholar to understand that the natives had their own tongue. The captains or lieutenants whose accounts we read had stood on the same beach, but when they sat down to record their experiences, powerful cultural presuppositions asserted themselves almost irresistibly.

For long before men without the full command of language, which is to say without eloquence, were thought to have been discovered in the New World, Renaissance humanists *knew* that such men existed, rather as modern scientists knew from the periodic table of the necessary existence of elements yet undiscovered. Virtually every Renaissance schoolboy read in Cicero's *De oratore* that only eloquence had been powerful enough "to gather scattered mankind together in one place, to transplant human beings from a barbarous life in the wilderness to a civilized social system, to establish organized communities, to equip them with laws and judicial safeguards and civic rights."<sup>20</sup> These lines, and similar passages from Isocrates and Quintilian, are echoed again and again in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as the proudest boast of the *studium humanitatis*. Eloquence, wrote Andrea Ugo of Siena in 1421, led wandering humanity from a savage, bestial existence to civilized culture. Likewise, Andrea Brenta of Padua declared in 1480 that primitive men had led brutish and lawless lives in the fields until eloquence brought them together and converted barbaric violence into humanity and culture.<sup>21</sup> And more than a hundred years later, Puttenham can make the same claim, in the same terms, on behalf of poetry:

Poesie was th'originall cause and occasion of their first assemblies, when before the people remained in the woods and mountains, vagarant and dispersed like the wild beasts, lawlesse and naked, or verie ill clad, and of all good and necessarie prouision for harbour or sustenance vtterly vnfurnished: so as they litle diffid for their manner of life, from the very brute beasts of the field.<sup>22</sup>

Curiously enough, a few pages later Puttenham cites the peoples of the New World as proof that poetry is more ancient than prose:

This is proued by certificate of marchants & travellers, who by late nauigations haue surveyed the whole world, and discovered large countries and strange peoples wild and sauage, affirming that the American, the Perusine & the very Canniball, do sing and also say, their highest and holiest matters in certaine riming versicles and not in prose.<sup>23</sup>

But it was more reasonable and logically consistent to conclude, as others did, that the savages of America were without eloquence or even without language. To validate one of their major tenets, humanists needed to reach such a conclusion, and they clung to it, in the face of all the evidence, with corresponding tenacity.

Moreover, both intellectual and popular culture in the Renaissance had kept alive the medieval figure of the Wild Man, one of whose common characteristics is the absence of speech. Thus when Spenser's Salvage Man, in Book VI of the *Faerie Queene*, wishes to express his compassion for a distressed damsel, he kisses his hands and crouches low to the ground,

For other language had he none, nor speech,  
But a soft murmur, and confused sound  
Of senselesse words, which Nature did him teach.<sup>24</sup>

To be sure, the Wild Man of medieval and Renaissance literature often turns out to be of gentle blood, having been lost, as an infant, in the woods; his language problem, then, is a consequence of his condition, rather than, as in Cicero, its prime cause. But this view accorded perfectly with the various speculations about the origins of the Indians, whether they were seen as lost descendants of the Trojans, Hebrews, Carthaginians, or Chinese. Indian speech, that speech no man could understand, could be viewed as the tattered remnants of a lost language.<sup>25</sup>

It is only a slight exaggeration, I think, to suggest that Europeans had, for centuries, rehearsed their encounter with the peoples of the New World, acting out, in their response to the legendary Wild Man, their mingled attraction and revulsion, longing and hatred. In the Christian Middle Ages, according to a recent account, "the Wild Man is the distillation of the specific anxieties underlying the three securities supposedly provided by the specifically Christian institutions of civilized life: the securities of sex (as organized by the institution of the family), *sustenance* (as provided by the political, social, and economic institutions), and *salvation* (as provided by the Church)."<sup>26</sup> These are precisely the areas in which the Indians most disturb their early observers. They appear to some to have no stable family life and are given instead to wantonness and perversion.<sup>27</sup> Nor, according to others, are they capable of political organization or settled social life. Against the campaign to free the enslaved Indians, it was argued that once given their liberty, they would return to their old ways: "For being idle and slothfull, they wander vp & downe, and returne to their olde rites and ceremonies, and foule and mischieuous actes."<sup>28</sup> And

everywhere we hear of their worship of idols which, in the eyes of the Europeans, strikingly resemble the images of devils in Christian art.<sup>29</sup>

Certainly the Indians were again and again identified as Wild Men, as wild, in the words of Francis Pretty, "as ever was a bucke or any other wilde beast."<sup>30</sup> "These men may very well and truly be called Wilde," writes Jacques Cartier, at once confirming and qualifying the popular name, "because there is no poorer people in the world."<sup>31</sup> Peter Martyr records tales of Wild Men in the New World, but he distinguishes them from the majority of the inhabitants:

They say there are certeyne wyld men whiche lyue in the caues and demes of the montaynes, contented onely with wilde frutes. These men neuer used the companie of any other: nor wyll by any means become tame. They lyue without any certayne dwellynge places, and with owte tyllage or culturyng of the grounde, as wee reade of them whiche in oulde tyme lyued in the golden age. They say also that these men are withowte any certaine language. They are sumtymes seene. But owre men haue yet layde handes on none of them.<sup>32</sup>

As Martyr's description suggests, Wild Men live beyond the pale of civilized life, outside all institutions, untouched by the long, slow development of human culture. If their existence is rude and repugnant, it also has, as Martyr's curious mention of the Golden Age suggests, a disturbing allure. The figure of the Wild Man, and the Indians identified as Wild Men, serve as a screen onto which Renaissance Europeans, bound by their institutions, project their darkest and yet most compelling fantasies. In the words of the earliest English tract on America:

the people of this lande haue no kynge nor lorde nor theyr god. But all thinges is commune/this people goeth all naked. . . . These folke lyuen lyke bestes without any resonablenes and the wyemen be also as comon. And the men hath conuersacyon with the wyemen/who that they ben or who they fyrst mete/is she his syster/his mother/his daughter/or any other kyndred. And the wyemen be very hooete and dysposed to lecherdnes. And they ete also on[e] a nother. The man etethe his wyfe his chylderne. . . . And that lande is ryght full of folke/ for they lyue commonly, iii. C. [300] yere and more as with sykenesse they dye nat.<sup>33</sup>

This bizarre description is, of course, an almost embarrassingly clinical delineation of the Freudian id. And the id, according to Freud, is without language.

At the furthest extreme, the Wild Man shades into the animal—one

possible source of the medieval legend being European observation of the great apes.<sup>34</sup> Language is, after all, one of the crucial ways of distinguishing between men and beasts: "The one special advantage we enjoy over animals," writes Cicero, "is our power to speak with one another, to express our thoughts in words."<sup>35</sup> Not surprisingly, then, there was some early speculation that the Indians were subhuman and thus, among other things, incapable of receiving the true faith. One of the early advocates on their behalf, Bernardino de Minaya, recalls that, on his return to Spain from the New World,

I went on foot, begging, to Valladolid, where I visited the cardinal and informed him that Friar Domingo [de Betanzos, an exponent of the theory that the Indians were beasts] knew neither the Indians' language nor their true nature. I told him of their ability and the right they had to become Christians. He replied that I was much deceived, for he understood that the Indians were no more than parrots, and he believed that Friar Domingo spoke with prophetic spirit. . . .<sup>36</sup>

The debate was dampened but by no means extinguished by Pope Paul III's condemnation, in the bull *Sublimis Deus* (1537), of the opinion that the Indians are "dumb brutes created for our service" and "incapable of receiving the Catholic faith."<sup>37</sup> Friar Domingo conceded in 1544 that the Indians had language but argued against training them for the clergy on the grounds that their language was defective, lacking the character and copiousness necessary to explain Christian doctrine without introducing great improprieties which could easily lead to great errors.<sup>38</sup> Similarly, Pierre Massée observes that the Brazilian Indians lack the letters F, L, and R, which they could only receive by divine inspiration, insofar as they have neither "Foy, Loy, ne Roy."<sup>39</sup> Ironically, it is here, in these virtual slanders, that we find some of the fullest acknowledgment of the enormous cultural gap between Europeans and Indians, and of the near impossibility of translating concepts like conversion, Incarnation, or the Trinity into native speech.<sup>40</sup>

Perhaps the profoundest literary exploration of these themes in the Renaissance is to be found in Shakespeare. In *The Tempest* the startling encounter between a lettered and an unlettered culture is heightened, almost parodied, in the relationship between a European whose entire source of power is his library and a savage who had no speech at all before the European's arrival. "Remember/First to possess his books," Caliban warns the lower-class and presumably illiterate Stephano and Trinculo,

for without them  
 He's but a sot, as I am, nor hath not  
 One spirit to command: they all do hate him  
 As rootedly as I. Burn but his books.<sup>41</sup>

This idea may well have had some historical analogue in the early years of conquest. In his *Thresor de l'histoire des langues de cest univers* (1607), Claude Duret reports that the Indians, fearing that their secrets would be recorded and revealed, would not approach certain trees whose leaves the Spanish used for paper, and Father Chaumonot writes in 1640 that the Hurons "were convinced that we were sorcerers, imposters come to take possession of their country, after having made them perish by our spells, which were shut up in our inkstands, in our books, etc.,—inasmuch that we dared not, without hiding ourselves, open a book or write anything."<sup>42</sup>

The link between *The Tempest* and the New World has often been noted, as, for example, by Terence Hawkes who suggests, in his book *Shakespeare's Talking Animals*, that in creating Prospero, the playwright's imagination was fired by the resemblance he perceived between himself and a colonist. "A colonist," writes Hawkes,

acts essentially as a dramatist. He imposes the 'shape' of his own culture, embodied in his speech, on the new world, and makes that world recognizable, habitable, 'natural,' able to speak his language.<sup>43</sup>

Conversely,

the dramatist is metaphorically a colonist. His art penetrates new areas of experience, his language expands the boundaries of our culture, and makes the new territory over in its own image. His 'raids on the inarticulate' open up new worlds for the imagination. (212)<sup>44</sup>

The problem for critics has been to accommodate this perceived resemblance between dramatist and colonist with a revulsion that reaches from the political critiques of colonialism in our own century back to the moral outrage of Las Casas and Montaigne. Moreover, there are many aspects of the play itself that make colonialism a problematical model for the theatrical imagination: if *The Tempest* holds up a mirror to empire, Shakespeare would appear deeply ambivalent about using the reflected image as a representation of his own practice.

Caliban enters in Act I, cursing Prospero and protesting bitterly: "This island's mine, by Sycorax my mother, / Which thou tak'st from

me" (I. ii. 333–34). When he first arrived, Prospero made much of Caliban, and Caliban, in turn, showed Prospero "all the qualities o' th' isle." But now, Caliban complains, "I am all the subjects that you have, / Which first was mine own King." Prospero replies angrily that he had treated Caliban "with human care" until he tried to rape Miranda, a charge Caliban does not deny. At this point, Miranda herself chimes in, with a speech Dryden and others have found disturbingly indelicate:

Abhorred slave,  
 Which any print of goodness wilt not take,  
 Being capable of all ill! I pitied thee,  
 Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour  
 One thing or other: when thou didst not, savage,  
 Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like  
 A thing most brutish, I endow'd thy purposes  
 With words that made them known. But thy vile race,  
 Though thou didst learn, had that in't which good natures  
 Could not abide to be with; therefore wast thou  
 Deservedly confin'd into this rock,  
 Who hadst deserv'd more than a prison.<sup>45</sup>

To this, Caliban replies:

You taught me language; and my profit on't  
 Is, I know how to curse. The red plague rid you  
 For learning me your language!  
 (I. ii. 353–67)

Caliban's retort might be taken as self-indictment: even with the gift of language, his nature is so debased that he can only learn to curse. But the lines refuse to mean this: what we experience instead is a sense of their devastating justness. Ugly, rude, savage, Caliban nevertheless achieves for an instant an absolute if intolerably bitter moral victory. There is no reply; only Prospero's command: "Hag-seed, hence! / Fetch us in fuel," coupled with an ugly threat:

If thou neglect'st, or dost unwillingly  
 What I command, I'll rack thee with old cramps,  
 Fill all thy bones with aches, make thee roar,  
 That beasts shall tremble at thy din.  
 (I. ii. 370–73)

What makes this exchange so powerful, I think, is that Caliban is anything but a Noble Savage. Shakespeare does not shrink from the darkest European fantasies about the Wild Man; indeed he exaggerates them: Caliban is deformed, lecherous, evil-smelling, idle, treacherous, naive, drunken, rebellious, violent, and devil-worshipping.<sup>46</sup> According to Prospero, he is not even human: a "born devil," "got by the devil himself / Upon thy wicked dam" (I. ii. 321–22). *The Tempest* utterly rejects the uniformitarian view of the human race, the view that would later triumph in the Enlightenment and prevail in the West to this day. All men, the play seems to suggest, are *not* alike; strip away the adornments of culture and you will *not* reach a single human essence. If anything, *The Tempest* seems closer in spirit to the attitude of the present-day inhabitants of Java who, according to Clifford Geertz, quite flatly say, "To be human is to be Javanese."<sup>47</sup>

And yet out of the midst of this attitude Caliban wins a momentary victory that is, quite simply, an assertion of inconsolable human pain and bitterness. And out of the midst of this attitude Prospero comes, at the end of the play, to say of Caliban, "this thing of darkness I / Acknowledge mine" (V. i. 275–76). Like Caliban's earlier reply, Prospero's words are ambiguous; they might be taken as a bare statement that the strange "demi-devil" is one of Prospero's party as opposed to Alonso's, or even that Caliban is Prospero's slave. But again the lines refuse to mean this: they acknowledge a deep, if entirely unsentimental, bond. By no means is Caliban accepted into the family of man; rather, he is claimed as Philoctetes might claim his own festering wound. Perhaps, too, the word "acknowledge" implies some moral responsibility, as when the Lord, in the King James translation of Jeremiah, exhorts men to "acknowledge thine iniquity, that thou hast transgressed against the Lord thy God" (3:13). Certainly the Caliban of Act V is in a very real sense Prospero's creature, and the bitter justness of his retort early in the play still casts a shadow at its close. With Prospero restored to his dukedom, the match of Ferdinand and Miranda blessed, Ariel freed to the elements, and even the wind and tides of the return voyage settled, Shakespeare leaves Caliban's fate naggingly unclear. Prospero has acknowledged a bond; that is all.

Arrogant, blindly obstinate, and destructive as was the belief that the Indians had no language at all, the opposite conviction—that there was no significant language barrier between Europeans and savages—may have had consequences as bad or worse. Superficially, this latter view is the more sympathetic and seductive, in that it never needs to be stated. It is hard, after all, to resist the story of the *caciques* of the

Cenú Indians who are reported by the Spanish captain to have rebutted the official claim to their land thus:

what I said about the Pope being the Lord of all the universe in the place of God, and that he had given the land of the Indies to the King of Castille, the Pope must have been drunk when he did it, for he gave what was not his; also . . . the King, who asked for, or received, this gift, must be some madman, for that he asked to have that given him which belonged to others.<sup>48</sup>

It is considerably less hard to resist the account of the *caciques* of new Granada who declared in a memorial sent to the pope in 1553 that "if by chance Your Holiness has been told that we are bestial, you are to understand that this is true inasmuch as we follow devilish rites and ceremonies."<sup>49</sup> The principle in both cases is the same: whatever the natives may have actually thought and said has been altered out of recognition by being cast in European diction and syntax.

Again and again in the early accounts, Europeans and Indians, after looking on each other's faces for the first time, converse without the slightest difficulty; indeed the Indians often speak with as great a facility in English or Spanish as the Renaissance gentlemen themselves. There were interpreters, to be sure, but these are frequently credited with linguistic feats that challenge belief. Thus Las Casas indignantly objects to the pretense that complex negotiations were conducted through the mediation of interpreters who, in actual fact, "communicate with a few phrases like 'Gimme bread,' 'Gimme food,' 'Take this, gimme that,' and otherwise carry on with gestures."<sup>50</sup> He argues that the narratives are intentionally falsified, to make the *conquistadores'* actions appear fairer and more deliberative than they actually were. There may have been such willful falsification, but there also seems to have been a great deal of what we may call "filling in the blanks." The Europeans and the interpreters themselves translated such fragments as they understood or thought they understood into a coherent story, and they came to believe quite easily that the story was what they had actually heard. There could be, and apparently were, murderous results.<sup>51</sup>

The savages in the early accounts of the New World may occasionally make strange noises—"Oh ho" or "bow-wow"<sup>52</sup>—but, once credited with intelligible speech, they employ our accents and are comfortable in our modes of thought. Thus the amorous daughter of a cruel *cacique*, we learn in *The Florida of the Inca*, saved the young Spanish captive with the following words:



Lest you lose faith in me and despair of your life or doubt that I will do everything in my power to save you . . . I will assist you to escape and find refuge if you are a man and have the courage to flee. For tonight, if you will come at a certain hour to a certain place, you will find an Indian in whom I shall entrust both your welfare and mine.<sup>53</sup>

★ It may be objected that this is narrative convention: as in adventure movies, the natives look exotic but speak our language. But such conventions are almost never mere technical conveniences. If it was immensely difficult in sixteenth-century narratives to represent a language barrier, it is because embedded in the narrative convention of the period was a powerful, unspoken belief in the isomorphic relationship between language and reality. The denial of Indian language or of the language barrier grew out of the same soil that, in the mid-seventeenth century, would bring forth the search for a universal language. Many sixteenth-century observers of the Indians seem to have assumed that language—their language—represented the true, rational order of things in the world. Accordingly, Indians were frequently either found defective in speech, and hence pushed toward the zone of wild things, or granted essentially the same speech as the Europeans. Linguists in the seventeenth century brought the underlying assumption to the surface, not, of course, to claim that English, or Latin, or even Hebrew expressed the shape of reality, but to advocate the discovery or fashioning of a universal language that would do so.

Behind this project, and behind the narrative convention that foregrounded it, lay the conviction that reality was one and universal, constituted identically for all men at all times and in all places. The ultimate grounds for this faith were theological and were many times explicitly voiced, as here by Raleigh in his *History of the World*:

The same just God who liueth and gouerneth all thinges for euer, doeth in these our times giue victorie, courage, and discouraige, raise, and throw downe Kinges, Estates, Cities, and Nations, for the same offenses which were committed of old, and are committed in the present.<sup>54</sup>

There is a single faith, a single text, a single reality.

This complex of convictions may illuminate that most startling document, the *Requerimiento*, which was drawn up in 1513 and put into effect the next year. The *Requerimiento* was to be read aloud to newly encountered peoples in the New World; it demands both obedience to the king and queen of Spain as rulers of the Indies by

virtue of the donation of the pope, and permission for the religious fathers to preach the true faith. If these demands are promptly met, many benefits are promised, but if there should be refusal or malicious delay, the consequences are made perfectly clear:

We shall take you and your wives and your children, and shall make slaves of them, and as such shall sell and dispose of them as their Highnesses may command; and we shall take away your goods, and shall do you all the mischief and damage that we can, as to vassals who do not obey, and refuse to receive their lord, and resist and contradict him; and we protest that the deaths and losses which shall accrue from this are your fault, and not that of their Highnesses, or ours, nor of these cavaliers who come with us. And that we have said this to you and made this Requisition, we request the notary here present to give us his testimony in writing, and we ask the rest who are present that they should be witnesses of this Requisition.<sup>55</sup>

Las Casas writes that he doesn't know "whether to laugh or cry at the absurdity" of the *Requerimiento*, an absurdity born out in the stories of its actual use.<sup>56</sup> In our times, Madariaga calls it "quaint and naive," but neither adjective seems to me appropriate for what is a diabolical and, in its way, sophisticated document.<sup>57</sup>

A strange blend of ritual, cynicism, legal fiction, and perverse idealism, the *Requerimiento* contains at its core the conviction that there is no serious language barrier between the Indians and the Europeans. To be sure, there are one or two hints of uneasiness, but they are not allowed to disrupt the illusion of scrupulous and meaningful communication established from the beginning:

On the part of the King, Don Fernando, and of Doña Juana, his daughter, Queen of Castille and Leon, subduers of the barbarous nations, we their servants notify and make known to you, as best we can, that the Lord our God, Living and Eternal, created the Heaven and the Earth, and one man and one woman, of whom you and we, and all the men of the world, were and are descendants, and all those who come after us.<sup>58</sup>

The proclamation that all men are brothers may seem an odd way to begin a document that ends with threats of enslavement and a denial of responsibility for all ensuing deaths and losses, but it is precisely this opening that justifies the close. That all human beings are descended from "one man and one woman" proves that there is a single human essence, a single reality. As such, all problems of communication are merely accidental. Indeed, the *Requerimiento* con-



veniently passes over in silence the biblical account of the variety of languages and the scattering of mankind. In Genesis 11, we are told that "the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech," until men began to build the tower of Babel:

And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city. (Gen. 11:6-8)

In place of this, the *Requerimiento* offers a demographic account of the dispersion of the human race:

on account of the multitude which has sprung from this man and woman in the five thousand years since the world was created, it was necessary that some men should go one way and some another, and that they should be divided into many kingdoms and provinces, for in one alone they could not be sustained.<sup>59</sup>

The Babel story has to be omitted, for to acknowledge it here would be to undermine the basic linguistic premise of the whole document.

The *Requerimiento*, then, forces us to confront the dangers inherent in what most of us would consider the central liberal tenet, namely the basic unity of mankind. The belief that a shared essence lies beneath our particular customs, stories, and language turns out to be the cornerstone of the document's self-righteousness and arrogance. It certainly did not cause the horrors of the Conquest, but it made those horrors easier for those at home to live with. After all, the Indians had been warned. The king and queen had promised "joyfully and benignantly" to receive them as vassals. The *Requerimiento* even offered to let them see the "certain writings" wherein the pope made his donation of the Indies. If, after all this, the Indians obstinately refused to comply, they themselves would have to bear responsibility for the inevitable consequences.

The two beliefs that I have discussed in this paper—that Indian language was deficient or non-existent and that there was no serious language barrier—are not, of course, the only sixteenth-century attitudes toward American speech. I have already mentioned some of the Europeans, missionaries, and laymen who took native tongues

seriously. There are, moreover, numerous practical acknowledgments of the language problem which do not simply reduce the native speech to gibberish. Thus René de Laudonnière reports that the Indians "every houre made us a 1000 discourses, being mervellous sorry that we could not understand them." Instead of simply throwing up his hands, he proceeds to ask the Indian names for various objects and comes gradually to understand a part of what they are saying.<sup>60</sup>

But the theoretical positions on Indian speech that we have considered press in from either side on the Old World's experience of the New. Though they seem to be opposite extremes, both positions reflect a fundamental inability to sustain the simultaneous perception of likeness and difference, the very special perception we give to metaphor. Instead they either push the Indians toward utter difference—and thus silence—or toward utter likeness—and thus the collapse of their own, unique identity. Shakespeare, in *The Tempest*, experiments with an extreme version of this problem, placing Caliban at the outer limits of difference only to insist upon a mysterious measure of resemblance. It is as if he were testing our capacity to sustain metaphor. And in this instance only, the audience achieves a fullness of understanding before Prospero does, an understanding that Prospero is only groping toward at the play's close. In the poisoned relationship between master and slave, Caliban can only curse; but we know that Caliban's consciousness is not simply a warped negation of Prospero's:

I prihee, let me bring thee where crabs grow;  
And I with my long nails will dig thee pig-nuts;  
Show thee a jay's nest, and instruct thee how  
To snare the nimble mamoset; I'll bring thee  
To clustering filberts, and sometimes I'll get thee  
Young scamels from the rock.

(II. ii. 167-72)

The rich, irreducible concreteness of the verse compels us to acknowledge the independence and integrity of Caliban's construction of reality. We do not sentimentalize this construction—indeed the play insists that we judge it and that we prefer another—but we cannot make it vanish into silence. Caliban's world has what we may call *opacity*, and the perfect emblem of that opacity is the fact that we do not to this day know the meaning of the word "scamel."

But it is not until Vico's *New Science* (1725) that we find a genuine theoretical breakthrough, a radical shift from the philosophical assumptions that helped to determine European response to alien languages and cultures. Vico refuses to accept the position by then widely

held that "in the vulgar languages meanings were fixed by convention," that "articulate human words have arbitrary significations." On the contrary, he insists, "because of their natural origins, they must have had natural significations."<sup>61</sup> Up to this point, he seems simply to be reverting to the old search for a universal character. But then he makes a momentous leap:

There remains, however, the very great difficulty: How is it that there are as many different vulgar tongues as there are peoples? To solve it, we must here establish this great truth: that, as the people have certainly by diversity of climates acquired different natures, from which have sprung as many different customs, so from their different natures and customs as many different languages have arisen. (p. 133)

For Vico, the key to the diversity of languages is not the arbitrary character of signs but the variety of human natures. Each language reflects and substantiates the specific character of the culture out of which it springs.

Vico, however, is far away from the first impact of the New World upon the Old, and, in truth, his insights have scarcely been fully explored in our own times. Europeans in the sixteenth century, like ourselves, find it difficult to credit another language with opacity. In other words, they render Indian language transparent, either by limiting or denying its existence or by dismissing its significance as an obstacle to communication between peoples. And as opacity is denied to native speech, so, by the same token, is it denied to native culture. For a specific language and a specific culture are not here, nor are they ever, entirely separable. To divorce them is to turn from the messy, confusing welter of details that characterize a particular society at a particular time to the cool realm of abstract principles. It is precisely to validate such high-sounding principles—"Eloquence brought men from barbarism to civility" or "All men are descended from one man and one woman"—that the Indian languages are peeled away and discarded like rubbish by so many of the early writers. But as we are now beginning fully to understand, reality for each society is constructed to a significant degree out of the *specific* qualities of its language and symbols. Discard the particular words and you have discarded the particular men. And so most of the people of the New World will never speak to us. That communication, with all that we might have learned, is lost to us forever.

## Notes

1. Samuel Daniel, *Poems and a Defence of Ryme*, ed. Arthur Colby Sprague (Cambridge 1930) 11, 957-962.

2. Peter Martyr, *The Decades of the Newe Worlde (De orbe novo)*, trans. Richard Eden, Decade 3, Book 9, in *The First Three English Books on America*, ed. Edward Arber (Birmingham 1885) 177.
  3. Antonio de Nebrija, *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, ed. Ig. González-Llubera (Oxford 1926) 3; Lewis Hanke, *Aristotle and the American Indians: A Study in Race Prejudice in the Modern World* (Chicago and London 1959) 8.
  4. Martyr (n. 2 above) Decade 2, Book 1, p. 106
  5. Christopher Columbus, *Journals and Other Documents on the Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*, trans. and ed. Samuel Eliot Morrison (New York 1963) 65. For the Spanish, see Cristoforo Colombo, *Diario de Colón, libro de la primera navegación y descubrimiento de la Indias*, ed. Carlos Sanz López [facsimile of the original transcript] (Madrid 1962) fol. 9b. There has been considerable debate about Columbus' journal, which survived only in Las Casas' transcription. But Las Casas indicates that he is quoting Columbus here, and the words are revealing, no matter who penned them.
  6. Augustine, *Concerning The City of God against the Pagans*, trans. Henry Bettenson, ed. David Knowles (Harmondsworth 1972) Book 19, Ch. 7, p. 861. The whole passage, with its reference to Roman linguistic colonialism, is interesting in this context:
 

... the diversity of languages separates man from man. For if two men meet, and are forced by some compelling reason not to pass on but to stay in company, then if neither knows the other's language, it is easier for dumb animals, even of different kinds, to associate together than these men, although both are human beings. For when men cannot communicate their thoughts to each other, simply because of difference of language, all the similarity of their common human nature is of no avail to unite them in fellowship. So true is this that a man would be more cheerful with his dog for company than with a foreigner. I shall be told that the Imperial City has been at pains to impose on conquered peoples not only her yoke but her language also, as a bond of peace and fellowship, so that there should be no lack of interpreters but even a profusion of them. True; but think of the cost of this achievement! Consider the scale of those wars, with all that slaughter of human beings, all the human blood that was shed!
- For a variation of the theme of linguistic isolation, see Shakespeare, *Richard II*, ed. Peter Ure (Cambridge, Mass. 1956) I. iii. 159-173.
7. Robert Fabian, in Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation* ... (12 vols. Glasgow 1903-05) 7. 155. Roy Harvey Pearce, "Primitivistic Ideas in the *Faerie Queene*," *Journal of English and German Philology* 44 (1945) 149.

8. In Hakluyt (n. 7 above) 7. 282.
9. See Lee Eldridge Huddleston, *Origins of the American Indians: European Concepts, 1492-1729*, Latin American Monographs 11 (Austin, Tex. 1967) 66.
10. Milton, *Prolustiones*, ed. Donald Leman Clark, trans. Bromley Smith, in *Works*, ed. Frank Allen Peterson (18 vols. New York 1931-38) 12. 277.
11. John H. Parry, *The Spanish Seaborne Empire* (London and New York 1966) 163. Cf. France V. Scholes and Ralph L. Roys: "Although some of the friars, notably Fray Luis de Villalpando and Fray Diego de Landa, learned to speak and write Maya and gave instruction to the others, it is doubtful whether more than half of the clergy became proficient in the language." Quoted in *Landa's relación de las cosas de Yucatán*, trans. Alfred M. Tozzer, *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology* 18 (1941) 70 n. 313.
12. Martyr (n. 2 above) Decade 1, Book 1, p. 67. See, in the same volume, Sebastian Münster, p. 29, and Martyr, Decade 2, Book 1, p. 138. For examples of word lists, see Martyr, Decade 3, Book 1, p. 45; Francisco López de Gómara, *The Pleasant Historie of the Conquest of the West India, now called New Spayne*, trans. T. N. (London 1578) 370 ff.; John Davis, in Hakluyt (n. 7 above) 7. 398-399; Sir Robert Dudley, in Hakluyt, 10. 211-212; William Strachey, *The Historie of Truall into Virginia Britania* (1612), ed. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund, Hakluyt Society, Ser. 2, 103 (London 1953) 174-207; James Rosier, "Extracts of a Virginian Voyage made An. 1605, by Capitaine George Waymouth," in Samuel Purchas, *Haklytus Posithumus, or Purchas his Pilgrimes*, Hakluyt Society, Extra series (20 vols. Glasgow 1905-07; rpt. of 1625 ed.) 18. 359. The most delightful of the lists is Roger Williams, *A Key into the Language of America* (London 1643; rpt. Providence, R.I. 1936). There are also sample conversations in Indian languages; see Williams, *Key*; Jean de Léry, *Navigatio in Brasiliam Americae*, Ch. 19, in Theodor de Bry, *Americae tertia pars* (Frankfort 1592) 250 ff.; Martyr (n. 2 above) Decade 3, Book 8, p. 170.
13. Lescarbot, in Claude Duret, *Thresor de l'histoire des langues de cest univers* (Cologne 1613) 954-955. I am indebted for this reference and for many useful suggestions to Professor Natalie Zemon Davis.
14. Montaigne, *Selected Essays*, trans. John Florio, ed. Walter Kaiser (Boston 1964) 79. The possibility that Indian language has traces of Greek is explored by Sarmiento de Gamboa and Gregorio García (see Huddleston [n. 9 above] 30, 73), and by Thomas Morton, *New English Canaan*, in *Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to the Origin, Settlement, and Progress of the Colonies in North America*, comp. Peter Force (4 vols. Washington [c. 1836-47]; rpt. New York 1947 and Gloucester, Mass. 1963) 2. 15-18.
15. Raleigh, *The Discoverie of the large and bewtiful Empire of Guiana*, ed. V. T. Harlow (London 1928) 38.
16. Quoted in Gary B. Nash, "The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind," in *The Wild Man Within: An Image in Western Thought from the Renaissance to Romanticism*, ed. Edward Dudley and Maximilian E. Novak (Pittsburgh 1972) 72. See, likewise, Cornelius J. Jaenen, "Amerindian Views of French Culture in the Seventeenth Century," *Canadian Historical Review* 55 (1974) 276-277.
17. Bartolomé de Las Casas, *A Selection of his Writings*, trans. and ed. George Sanderlin (New York 1971) 144. Thomas More makes the same point in the early sixteenth century to defend English: "For as for that our tong is called barbarous, is but a fantasie. For so is, as euery lerned man knoweth, euery strange language to other." (*Dialogue concerning Heresies*, quoted in J. I. Moore, *Tudor-Stuart Views on the Growth, Status, and Destiny of the English Language*, Studien zur Englischen Philologie 41 (Halle 1920) 19.
18. Oviedo, quoted in Sir Arthur Helps, *The Spanish Conquest of America and its Relation to the History of Slavery and to the Government of Colonies*, ed. M. Oppenheim (4 vols. London 1900-04; rpt. New York 1966) 1. 269.
19. For a nineteenth-century variation, see Daniel Webster's remark in a letter to Ticknor, 1 March 1826: "I ought to say that I am a total unbeliever in the new doctrines about the Indian languages. I believe them to be the rudest forms of speech; and I believe there is as little in the languages of the tribes as in their laws, manners, and customs, worth studying or worth knowing. All this is heresy, I know, but so I think"; see George Ticknor Curtis, *Life of Daniel Webster* (2 vols. New York 1872) 1. 260. By 1826, it should be noted, Webster is on the defensive. I owe this reference to Professor Larzer Ziff.
20. Cicero, *De oratore* I. viii. 33, in *On the Good Life*, trans. Michael Grant (Harmondsworth 1971) 247.
21. Andrea Ugo and Andrea Brenta, in Karl Müllner, *Reden und Briefe Italienscher Humanisten* (Vienna 1899) 110-111, 75-76. See, likewise in the same volume, the orations of Lapo de Castiglione, Andrea Giuliano of Venice, Francesco Filello, Antonio da Rho, Tiphernas (Gregorio da Città di Castello), and Giovanni Toscanella.
22. George(?) Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London 1589; Scholar Press facs. ed. Menston 1968) 3-4. The myth that Orpheus tamed wild beasts by his music is intended to show, according to Puttenham, "how by his discrete and wholesome lessons vttered in harmonie and with melodious instruments, he brought the rude and sauage people to a more ciuill and orderly life, nothing, as it seemeth, more preuailling or fit to redresse and edifie the cruell and sturdie courage of man then it" (4). Without speech, according to Hobbes, "there had been amongst men, neither commonwealth, nor society, nor contract, nor peace, no more than amongst lions, bears, and wolves," *Leviathan*, ed. Michael Oakeshott (Oxford 1960) 18.

23. Puttenham (n. 22 above) 7. See also Sir Philip Sidney, *An Apologie for Poetrie*, in *English Literary Criticism: The Renaissance*, ed. O. B. Hardison, Jr. (New York 1963): "Euen among the most barbarous and simple Indians where no writing is, yet haue they their Poets, who make and sing songs, which they call *Areytos*, both of theyr Ancestors deedes and praises of theyr Gods: a sufficient probabilitie that if euer learning come among them, it must be by hauing theyr hard dull wits softened and sharpened with the sweete delights of Poetrie. For vntill they find a pleasure in the exercises of the minde, great promises of much knowledge will little perswade them that knowe not the fruites of knowledge" (102). On the Indian *Areytos*, see Martyr (n. 2 above) Decade 3, Book 7, pp. 166–167; likewise, Las Casas, *History of the Indies*, trans. and ed. André Collard (New York 1971) 279–280. For a comparable phenomenon in the British Isles, see J. E. C. Hill, "Puritans and The Dark Corners of the Land," *Royal Historical Society Transactions*, Ser. 5, 13 (1963) 82: "On Sundays and holy days, we are told of North Wales about 1600, 'the multitude of all sorts of men, women and children' used to meet to hear 'their harpers and crowthers sing them songs of the doings of their ancestors.'"
24. *The Faerie Queene*, VI. iv. 11, in *The Works of Edmund Spenser. A Variorum Edition*, ed. Edwin Grenlaw *et al.* (9 vols. Baltimore 1932–49). On Spenser's Wild Man, see Pearce (n. 7 above) and Donald Cheney, *Spenser's Image of Nature: Wild Man and Shepherd in "The Faerie Queene"* (New Haven 1966). On the figure of the Wild Man, see Dudley and Novak (n. 16 above); Richard Bernheimer, *Wild Men in the Middle Ages: A Study in Art, Sentiment, and Demonology* (Cambridge, Mass. 1952).
25. On the comparison of Indian and Old World words, see Huddleston (n. 9 above) esp. 23, 30, 37, 44, 91–92. The Indians were described by Cotton Mather as "the veriest ruines of mankind, which [were] to be found any where upon the face of the earth": quoted in Roy Harvey Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind* (Baltimore 1965; rpt. 1967) 29.
26. Hayden White, "The Forms of Willfulness: Archaeology of an Idea," in Dudley and Novak (n. 16 above) 21.
27. "Thei vse no lawfull coniunction of marriage, but euery one hath as many women as him listeth, and leaue them agayn at his pleasure," Sebastian Münster, *A Treatise of the Newe India*, trans. Richard Eden, in Arber (n. 2 above) 37. See, likewise, Martyr (n. 2 above) Decade 3, Book 1, p. 138; Martyr, trans. Michael Lok, in *A Selection of Curious, Rare, and Early Voyages and Histories of Interesting Discoveries chiefly published by Hakluyt . . .* (London 1812) Decade 8, Ch. 8, p. 673; Landonnère, in Hakluyt (n. 7 above) 8, 453; Henry Hawks, in Hakluyt (n. 7 above) 9, 386; Bernal Diaz del Castillo, *The Conquest of New Spain*, trans. J. M. Cohen (Baltimore 1963) 19, 122, 124. On one of Frobisher's voyages, a native man and woman, captured separately, are brought together before the silent and eagerly expectant sailors. The observers are astonished at the
- "shamefastnes and chastity of those Savage captives" (in Hakluyt [n. 7 above] 7, 306).
28. Martyr, trans. Lok (n. 27 above) Decade 7, Ch. 4, p. 627. "Wandering up and down" seems almost as much of an offense as idolatry. There is a trace of this disapproval and anxiety in Iago's description of Othello as an "erring barbarian," an "extravagant and wheeling stranger."
29. See for example, Martyr, trans. Lok (n. 27 above) Decade 4, Ch. 9, p. 539: "with such a countenance, as we use to paint hobgoblins or spirits which walke by night."
30. In Hakluyt (n. 7 above) 11, 297. Note that Spenser uses the same metaphor for his Wild Man: "For he was swift as any bucke in chace" (*FQ*, VI. iv. 8).
31. In Hakluyt (n. 7 above) 8, 201–202.
32. Martyr, ed. Arber (n. 2 above) Decade 3, Book 8, p. 173
33. *Of the newe landes*, in Arber (n. 2 above) p. xxvii; cf. Wilberforce Eames, "Description of a Wood Engraving Illustrating the South American Indians (1505)," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 26 (1922) 755–760.
34. See Horst Woldemar Janson, *Apes and Ape Lore in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (London 1952).
35. Cicero, *De oratore* I. viii. 32, in *On the Good Life* (n. 20 above) 247.
36. Quoted in Lewis Hanke, "Pope Paul III and the American Indians," *Harvard Theological Review* 30 (1937) 84.
37. Quoted in Hanke (n. 36 above) 72; likewise in Hanke (n. 3 above) 19.
38. Quoted in Hanke (n. 36 above) 102. On his death-bed, Domingo de Betanzos recanted his denigration of the Indians.
39. Massé, in Duret (n. 13 above) 945.
40. For a more sympathetic grasp of the problem of translating religious concepts, see Las Casas (n. 23 above) 238–239; Marc Lescarbot, *History of New France*, trans. W. L. Grant (3 vols. Toronto 1907–14) 2, 179–180; José de Acosta, *The Natural and Moral History of the Indies*, trans. Edward Grimston [1604], ed. Clements R. Markham, Hakluyt Society 60–61 (2 vols. London 1880) 2, 301–302. Cornelius Jaenen (n. 16 above) suggests that the difficulty was more cultural than linguistic: "The natives saw some danger in divulging their religious vocabulary to the evangelists of the new religion, therefore they refused to cooperate extensively in the linguistic task of compiling dictionaries and grammars, and of translating religious books" (277).
41. *The Tempest*, ed. Frank Kermode (Cambridge, Mass. 1954) III. ii. 90–93.
42. Duret (n. 13 above) 935; Chaumonot, quoted in Jaenen (n. 16 above) 275–276.
43. Terence Hawkes, *Shakespeare's Talking Animals* (London 1973) 211. For another appraisal of colonialism in *The Tempest*, see Dominique O. Man-

- noni, *Prospero and Caliban: The Psychology of Colonization*, trans. Pamela Powesland (New York 1956) 97–109.
44. "Raids on the inarticulate"—the quotation is from T. S. Eliot's *Four Quartets* and, as Hawkes uses it, eerily invokes the sixteenth-century fantasy that the Indians were without speech.
45. The lines are sometimes attributed, without any textual authority, to Prospero. "Which any print of goodness wilt not take," it might be noted, plays on the *tabula rasa* theme.
46. Shakespeare even appeals to early seventeenth-century class fears by having Caliban form an alliance with the lower-class Stephano and Trinculo to overthrow the noble Prospero. On class-consciousness in the period, see Christopher Hill, "The Many-Headed Monster in Late Tudor and Early Stuart Political Thinking," in *From the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation. Essays in Honor of Garrett Mattingly*, ed. Charles H. Carter (New York 1965) 296–324.
47. Clifford Geertz, "The Impact of the Concept of Culture on the Concept of Man," in his selected essays, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York 1973) 52. I am indebted throughout to this suggestive essay.
48. Enciso, *Suma de geographia*, quoted in Helps (n. 18 above) 1. 279–280.
49. Quoted in Hanke (n. 36 above) 95. It is not impossible that the *caciques* said something vaguely similar; see Las Casas (n. 23 above) 82: "what could we expect from these gentle and unprotected Indians suffering such torments, servitude and decimation but immense pusillanimity, profound discouragement and annihilation of their inner selves, to the point of doubting whether they were men or mere cats?"
50. Las Casas (n. 23 above) 241
51. *Ibid.*, 50–52, 130–131.
52. Both are in James Rosier (n. 12 above) 18. 342, 344.
53. Garcilaso de la Vega, *The Florida of the Inca*, trans. and ed. John Grier Varner and Jeannette Johnson Varner (Austin, Tex. 1951) 69–70; quoted by Howard Mumford Jones, *O Strange New World, American Culture: The Formative Years* (New York 1964; Viking paperback ed. 1967) 25–26.
54. Sir Walter Raleigh, *The History of the World* (London 1614) II. xix. 3, pp. 508–509.
55. In Helps (n. 18 above) 1. 266–267.
56. Las Casas (n. 23 above) 196. "For the actual use of the *Requerimiento*, see Lewis Hanke, *The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America* (Philadelphia 1949; rpt. Boston 1965) 34.
57. Salvador de Madariaga, *The Rise of the Spanish American Empire* (New York 1947) 12.

58. In Helps (n. 18 above) 1. 264.
59. *Ibid.*
60. In Hakluyt (n. 7 above) 8. 466.
61. Giambattista Vico, *The New Science*, trans. Thomas G. Bergin and Max H. Fisch (Ithaca 1948) 132.